Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/591,032	MARINI, MAURIZIO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	NICOLAS A. ARNETT	3751
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>NICOLAS A. ARNETT</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>MATTHEW A. PEQUIGNOT</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 2 November 2009	Time: <u>1400</u>	
Type of Interview:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1 and 9		
, 5,72 5		
Prior art documents discussed:		
B 44		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>		
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The parties discussed an amendment to the claims to place the application in condition for allowance. Regarding claim 1, the parties discussed changing the phrase "integrated in" to "integrated inside" to clarify that the valve device is positioned inside the vessel rather than attached externally to the container to cover the opening. Regarding claim 9, the parties discussed changing the dependency to claim 8 rather than claim 14 and omitting the limitation "and said rod...said axial conduit" to overcome a potential rejection for lack of antecedent basis within the claims. The Applicant agreed to the changes proposed by the examiner and those changes are presented in the Examiner's Amendment.